



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,560	02/24/2000	Yudong Sun	ST9-99-153	6032

21552 7590 08/13/2003
MADSON & METCALF
GATEWAY TOWER WEST
SUITE 900
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/512,560	SUN, YUDONG	
	Examiner Adam L Basehoar	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2 and 3</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Information Disclosure Statements filed on 02/24/00 and 02/26/02 respectively, of the application filed on 02/24/00.
2. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C's "Introduction to CSS2", <http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-CSS2/intro.html#processing-model>, 05/12/98 in view of Hill et al (US 6,023,714: 02/08/00).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 21, W3C teaches a user agent computer processing method, system, and article of manufacture, wherein the method "parses the source document (HTML) and create a document tree", wherein the step of creating could generate a corresponding "DOM"; "retrieving all style sheets associated with the document that are specified for the target media type"; "Annotate every element of the document tree by assigning a single value to every property that is applicable to the target media type"; "From the annotated document tree, generating a *formatting structure*"; and " Transfer the formatting structure to the

target medium (e.g., print the results, display them on the screen, render them as speech, etc.)” (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model: Steps 1-6). W3C does not teach that customizing a requested document is done on the document server side. Hill et al teaches that customizing the requested document can be done on the server side as well as the client side (column 2, lines 30-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have customized a requested HTML document for target device on the server side, because it was well known in the art that some end-user client devices do not support cascading style-sheet processing. W3C also does not teach flattening the DOM to generate the transformed document. As stated by the applicant, “flattening” a DOM strictly means converting it back into standard HTML format and that “flattening” was well known in the art and thus would have been obvious (page 16, lines 15-19). W3C further doesn’t teach that the steps of parsing, obtaining a style sheet, applying the style sheet, and flattening the DOM are done with modules. The applicant teaches that “modules” can be software, hardware, or firmware (page 10, lines 10-12). Hill et al teach that “generally, program modules include routines, programs, components, data structures, etc.” It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to implement the above steps on a computer system using modules (i.e software, hardware, programs, data structures, etc), because it was well known in the art that any processing of data on a computer system needs at least a subset of these to perform.

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 12, and 22, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet is a cascading style sheet (CSS) (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model).

-In regard to dependent claims 3,13, and 23, W3C further teaches “identifying the target media type” and “Annotate every element of the document tree by assigning a single value to every property that is applicable to the target media type”(Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model; Steps 2-4).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 24, Hill et al further teach the “server receiving a document request from the client” (Fig 5: 502). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for a server to receive a request for a document from a client, because it was well known in the art that for a client to receive a document (data) from a server system, it must request it and the server must process that request.

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 15, and 25, Hill et al further teach wherein the client contains a Web browser (Fig. 2: 204 & 206). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the client to have had a Web browsr because it was well known in the art to use a Web browser to access documents on a server which is the embodiment of the invention.

-In regard to dependent claims 6, 16, and 26, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet can contain “@media rule specifies the target media types (separated by commas) of a set of rules (delimited by curly braces). The @media construct allows style sheet rules for various media in the same style sheet.” (Section: 7.2.1 The @media rule)

-In regard to dependent claims 7-8, 17-18, and 27-28, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet is stored “either within the HTML document” (separate portion of document), “or via an external style sheet” (separate data file) (Section: 2.1 A brief CSS2 tutorial for HTML).

-In regard to dependent claims 9, 19, and 29, W3C further teaches “transferring the formatting structure to the target medium (e.g., print the results, display them on the screen, render them as speech, etc.)” (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model).

-In regard to dependent claims 10, 20, and 30, W3C further teaches generating nothing (removing) at least one object of the DOM in a response to a style sheet removal of an HTML element, wherein “if an element in the document tree has a value of 'none' for the 'display' property, that element will generate nothing in the formatting structure,” (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model; Step 5)

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,589,291 07/08/03 Boag et al.

US 6,546,406 04/08/03 DeRose et al.

L. Wood, "Document Object Model Specification", October 1997, <http://www.w3.org/TR/WD-DOM/>

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB
July 28, 2003



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER